

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

10

16

21

24

1 Officer for WSH, conducted a review of Appellant's position. Ms. Glad determined that
2 Appellant's position was properly allocated to the Institution Counselor 2 classification.

3 Appellant appealed Ms. Glad's decision to the Director of the Department of Personnel. The
4 Director's designee, Jamie M. Peck, conducted an allocation review of Appellant's position. By
5 letter dated October 15, 1998, Ms. Peck determined that Appellant's position was properly
6 allocated. On November 12, 1998, Appellant filed timely exceptions to the Director's determination
7 with the Personnel Appeals Board. Appellant's exceptions are the subject of this proceeding.
8

9 In summary, Appellant disagrees with the Director's findings that Program for Adaptive Living
10 Skills (PALS) patients are not considered difficult patients as described in the definition of the
11 Institution Counselor 3 classification.

12 **Summary of Appellant's Argument.** Appellant argues that his position should be reallocated to
13 the Institution Counselor 3 classification because on a regular basis, patients assigned to PALS are
14 assaultive, delusional and threatening. Appellant contends that the PALS program serves
15 chronically, mentally ill patients who have been stabilized and are preparing to be released into the
16 community. Appellant asserts that the PALS program has a 30 percent recidivism rate and that
17 when a patient regresses, staff are frequently assaulted and injured. Appellant contends that the
18 patients served by the PALS program meet the definition of more difficult assaultive cases as
19 described by the Institution Counselor 3 classification.
20

21 **Summary of Respondent's Argument.** Respondent argues that Appellant's position best fits the
22 Institution Counselor 2 classification. Respondent asserts that patients are stabilized before being
23 assigned to the PALS program. While a percentage of patients do regress, on the whole, the
24 patients assigned to PALS are less difficult than the patients housed in the main institution of WSH.
25 Respondent contends that when a PALS patient shows signs of regressing, the patient is sent back
26 to the main institution. Respondent further contends that the Institution Counselor 3 classification

1 was designed to be used in the main institution. Because Appellant does not work with the more
2 difficult patients a majority of the time, Respondent argues that his position best fits the Institution
3 Counselor 2 classification.

4 **Primary Issue.** Whether the Director's determination that Appellant's position is properly
5 allocated to the Institution Counselor 2 classification should be affirmed.

6
7 **Relevant Classifications.** Institution Counselor 2, class code 35450, and Institution Counselor 3,
8 class code 35460.

9
10 **Decision of the Board.** The purpose of a position review is to determine which classification best
11 describes the overall duties and responsibilities of a position. A position review is neither a
12 measurement of the volume of work performed, nor an evaluation of the expertise with which that
13 work is performed. Also, a position review is not a comparison of work performed by employees in
14 similar positions. A position review is a comparison of the duties and responsibilities of a particular
15 position to the available classification specifications. This review results in a determination of the
16 class which best describes the overall duties and responsibilities of the position. Liddle-Stamper v.
17 Washington State University, PAB Case No. 3722-A2 (1994).

18 It is unrefuted that some of the patients in the PALS program are difficult. However, when a patient
19 becomes assaultive, the patient is returned to the main institution. Seventy percent of PALS
20 patients are successfully treated and released. Therefore, the majority of PALS patients are not
21 more difficult cases as described in the definition of the Institution Counselor 3 classification.
22 Furthermore, the Institution Counselor 3 classification requires incumbents to be specialists or
23 intensive service workers. Appellant is not a specialist and he is not an intensive service worker.
24 Rather, a majority of the time, Appellant counsels and assists PALS patients to improve their
25 adjustment to the community. Appellant's position is best described by the Institution Counselor 2
26 classification.

1 If class specifications become outdated as functions of positions evolve, the Personnel Appeals
2 Board is not the proper entity to rewrite class specifications. Sorenson v. Dep't of Social and
3 Health Services, PAB No. A94-020 (1995). We encourage Respondent to work with the
4 Department of Personnel to review the Institution Counselor class series. While we find that the 2
5 level is the best fit for Appellant's position, the language in the series has not been revised since
6 before the PALS program was established. Therefore, the series should be revised so that it
7 specifically addresses the unique environment and clientele found in the PALS program.
8

9 **Conclusion.** The appeal on exceptions by Appellant should be denied and the Director's
10 determination dated October 15, 1998, should be affirmed and adopted.

11
12 **ORDER**

13 NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the appeal on exceptions by Appellant is
14 denied and the Director's determination dated October 15, 1998, is affirmed and adopted. A copy is
15 attached.

16 DATED this _____ day of _____, 1999.

17 WASHINGTON STATE PERSONNEL APPEALS BOARD

18
19 _____
Walter T. Hubbard, Chair

20
21 _____
Nathan S. Ford Jr., Vice Chair

22
23 _____
Gerald L. Morgen, Member
24
25
26